DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 145 SO 001 000

AUTHOR Tucker, Jan L.
TITLE Pre-Service, Secondary School Teacher Educators and the "New" Social Studies.
PUB DATE Feb 71
NOTE 29p.; Revision of a paper presented at the Annual Convention, American Educational Research Association, New York, New York February 1971

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS College Teachers, Curriculum Development, Curriculum Evaluation, *Curriculum Research, Educational Objectives, Educational Research, Education Courses, *Methods Teachers, *Preservice Education, Projects, *Social Studies, *Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Background, Teacher Education, Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS *New Social Studies, NSS, Stanford University

ABSTRACT

Purposes of this research were to: 1) identify major characteristics of the "new" social studies (NSS) as perceived by methods teachers; 2) compare are-being emphasized perceptions with what methods teachers think ought-to-be emphasized; and, 3) discover relationships between what methods teachers think should be happening and other variables. A 21 page questionnaire was administered to a sampling of pre-service, secondary level instructors from National Council for Social Studies membership, 1969. Data returns and detailed analysis are presented. Some general findings were that methods teachers 1) tend to equate the NSS with major curriculum projects; 2) were dissatisfied with the strong developmental role played by the projects; 3) saw the NSS as overly academic, cerebral, and teacher centered; and, 4) wanted more emphasis on student interests, community activities, social action, and affective domain. Also, methods teachers who held appointments in schools of education tended to be more dissatisfied with the NSS than those in academic departments. Complete research results and their implications are thoroughly discussed with three explanatory hypotheses offered for the unfavorable perceptions. Of the three (obsolescence, role-conflict, and value-conflict) the researcher speculates that the value-conflict hypothesis is the most explanatory yet most difficult to deal with. Related documents are SO 000 922 and SO 000 764. (Author/JSB)

ED049145

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PRE-SERVICE, SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHER EDUCATORS AND THE "NEW" SOCIAL STUDIES

A Manuscript By:

Jan L. Tucker
Stanford University**

**The author wishes to recognize the invaluable contributions of Mr. William Kline (Stanford University) and Mrs. Claudia Kaye Schoonhoven (Chabot College) to the design and analysis of this research. This article is a revision of a paper given at a Social Studies Special Interest Group Session of the American Educational Research Association, New York, February 1971.

SP 001 000

The Problem

During the past decade, it has become increasingly commonplace to acknowledge the important impact of the 'new" social studies (NSS) upon social studies education. However, some leading educators have questioned whether this impact has been completely in the best interests of the social studies.[1] Conceptual problems have also been identified; several studies have pointed out the vagueness, ambiguity, or multiplicity of the concept of the "new" social studies.[2] Much, perhaps most, of this literature has been produced by those whose career lines are centered in teaching and research in education, many of them teacher educators. With some important exceptions, these critics have not been deeply involved in the major materials development projects of the 1960's.[3]

These observations raise intriguing questions about the development, dissemination, and maintenance of the NSS. For instance, is it merely a coincidence that the major critics of the NSS are teacher educators? Are the criticisms voiced in the literature widespread among teacher educators? What changes are being wrought within the 'culture" of the social studies profession as a result of the entry, mainly through the social studies projects, of new leaders and different values into the fields? These questions identify the need to develop a new meta-research perspective, to step outside the social studies 'culture," and to look back and examine ourselves. One logical place to begin such an inquiry is to view the NSS through the eyes of teacher educators.

The purpose of the present study was three-fold: 1) to identify the major characteristics of the so-called "new" social studies as perceived by methods teachers engaged in the preparation of secondary, pre-service social studies teachers; 2) to compare these are-being emphasized perceptions with what method teachers think ought-to-be emphasized; and 3) to discover if there are relationships between what methods teachers think should be happening in the field and other variables, such as the type of academic training, length of service as a secondary teacher, and the type of academic appointment held by a methods teacher.

Procedures

A 21-page questionnaire, based upon selected characteristics of social studies education identified or inferred through an extensive analysis of the professional literature, was developed. Three types of questions were employed: comparative-word pairs, agree strongly-disagree strongly (Likert), and rank order. The questions were designed to reflect potential areas of tension and disagreement. For instance, should the social studies emphasize the cognitive domain over the affective domain or social science over history? All questions were written and arranged to minimize the possibility of unreflectively "picking one end of the scale." Also, questions calling for similar answers were spaced throughout the questionnaire in order to check the respondent's consistency in answering the questions. Appendices I and II represent the actual comparative placement of all the variables contained in the original questionnaire, excepting the rank-order questions. The rank-order questions reported in this study are found in Tables One and Two. The questionnaire was piloted and tested with two groups: social studies teachers in training in the

Stanford Teacher Education Program, and the faculty of the Social Science Education Department at San Jose State College.

The mailing sample of 234 social studies instructors were randomly selected (geographically stratified) from the total number of 806 college or university educators who were members of the National Council for the Social Studies.[4] Questionnaires were mailed May 15, 1969. One postcard follow-up was sent 2½ weeks after the initial mailing. One-hundred nineteen of the questionnaires were returned (50.9% of the mailing sample). One hundred three of these were selected as fulfilling the "pre-service, secondary-level" standard. These 103 represent 58.9% of the 175 pre-service, secondary school social studies instructors estimated to be found within the mailing sample of 234.[5] The results of the study can be generalized only to the pre-service, secondary level instructors who were on the NCSS roles in 1969. It seems reasonable, however, that this population was (and is) more knowledgeable and influential than non-NCSS teacher educators.

Data Reduction

The data were organized according to the three purposes of the study. For the first purpose, identifying the major characteristics of the NSS, the findings were represented by a "percentage of agreement"(See Appendices I and II). This percentage indicates the amount of agreement among methods teachers about the characteristics of the NSS. The scale is: Very High Agreement (VHA), 65% and above; High Agreement (HA), 50-64%; Low Agreement (LA), 35-49%; and Very Low Agreement (VLA), 34% or less.

For the second purpose, comparison of the "is" and "ought" profiles, the data were categorized by a percentage figure indicating a relative shift between the "Are-being" and the "Ought-to-be" emphasized characteristics of the NSS on a five-point response scale: Agree Strongly, Agree, Equal, Agree, and Agree Strongly and by a Directional Intensity of Dissatisfaction Index (DID). DID indicates the "intensity" to which a particular word-variable is preferred over its counterpart. The larger the DID, the greater the intensity (See page I, Appendix I). The McNemar test ($p < .05$) was used to determine if the dissatisfaction was statistically significant.

The third purpose of the study was to determine relationships between variables such as the type of academic appointment and method educators' attitudes about what they think ought to be going on in the social studies field. Chi-square ($p < .05$) was used to determine statistical significance. Cells were collapsed when necessary and appropriate (See Table Four).

Major Findings

A basic finding of the study was that methods teachers saw a distinct division of labor within the NSS with respect to what can be labeled the "developmental" and "educational" roles. On the one hand, methods teachers ranked the materials projects as the most important source of the basic developments associated with the NSS (Table One). In the minds of methods teachers the projects, more than any other group, have served the developmental role for the NSS. In fact, the materials projects and the NSS were practically synonymous.

* *

Place Table One About Here

* *

TABLE ONE

DEVELOPMENTAL CONTRIBUTORS: ACCORDING TO RANK ORDER MEANS*

(N=105)

According to methods teachers, the most significant developmental contributors to recent activity in the social studies:

Contributor	"are"		"ought-to-be"	
	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$
Social Studies Projects (USOE, NSF, etc.).	1	2.10	3	3.33
Professional Organizations (NCSS, etc.).	2	3.25	2	3.05
Schools of Education	3	3.60	4	3.47
Academic Department of Colleges and Universities	4	4.26	5	3.94
Classroom Teachers	5	4.49	1	3.01
State Departments of Public Instruction	6	4.64	6	4.90
School Administrators	7	5.59	7	5.77

*Developmental contributors were ranked in order of importance 1-7. A lower mean indicates greater importance.

Conversely, methods educators did not see themselves in a major developmental role. Not surprisingly, they considered their own methods courses to be serving the primary educational function for pre-service teachers (Table Two).

* *

Place Table Two About Here

* *

By examining the "ought-to-be" profile, we find that methods teachers tended to be displeased with the current division of labor. While they wished to retain the upper hand with respect to the educational role (Table Two), they preferred that the developmental role be shifted away from the USOE and NSF projects, and to a much greater degree placed in the hands of classroom teachers (Table One). Interestingly, methods teachers did not believe that their own role should include much curriculum development, even less than they judged to be the case.

Disagreement over the appropriate source of curriculum development was not the only area where the emphasis of the NSS was perceived to be misplaced. Methods teachers also believed that certain educational objectives and values have been accorded priority at the expense of others that are equally, if not more important (Table Three).

* *

Place Table Three About Here

* *

These different priorities of teacher educators do not add up to an entirely clear or consistent profile. For instance, it is difficult to see how one could simultaneously argue for more emphasis on patriotic values and greater emphasis on "open-ended" divergent inquiry. But it is also very evident

TABLE TWO

EDUCATIONAL LINK: IMPORTANCE ACCORDING TO RANK ORDER MEANS* (N=103)

According to methods teachers, the major educational link for the pre-service social studies teacher between the theory and practice of recent developments:

Educational Link	"is"		"ought-to-be"	
	Rank	$\overline{X}$	Rank	$\overline{X}$
Curriculum and Instruction (methods) Courses in Schools of Education	1	1.76	1	1.68
Academic Course Work	2	2.94	2	3.03
Professional Organizations (Publications,Meetings,etc.)	3	3.17	3	3.44
Workshops, Institutes, or Teacher Education Programs not Sponsored by a Development Project	4	4.09	4	4.11
Workshops, Institutes, or Teacher Education Programs Sponsored by a Development Project	5	4.18	5	4.20
Regional R&D Laboratories (ESEA)	6	4.64	6	4.53

*Educational links were ranked in order of importance, 1-6. A lower mean indicates greater importance.

TABLE THREE

DISSATISFACTION WITH THE NSS AS EXPRESSED
BY TEACHER EDUCATORS *

More emphasis should be placed on: (X^2, $p < .05$)

1. Patriotic Values compared with Values of Scientific Inquiry.
2. "Open-ended" Divergent Inquiry c/w "Closed" Convergent Inquiry.
3. Controversial Topics c/w Non-controversial Topics.
4. Value Commitment c/w Value Clarification.
5. Value-included Inquiry c/w Value-excluded Inquiry.
6. Philosophy c/w Social Science
7. Human Significance c/w Human Efficiency.
8. Comparative History c/w National History.
9. The Future c/w the Present.
10. Social Studies c/w Social Science.
11. Interdisciplinary Curricula c/w Separate Discipline Curricula.
12. Individuals c/w Social Systems.
13. Affective Domain c/w Cognitive Domain.
14. Reading Skill c/w Discussion Skill.
15. Community Activities c/w Classroom Activities.
16. Teacher-developed Content c/w Pre-packaged Content.
17. Self-concept Development c/w Academic Achievement
18. Teaching Methodology c/w Curriculum Development.
19. Academically Below-average Students c/w Academically Above-Average Students.
20. Melioration of Social Problems c/w Knowledge of Academic Disciplines.
21. Local Curriculum Development c/w National Curriculum Development.
22. History as a Humanistic Discipline c/w History as a Scientific Discipline.
23. Normative Problems c/w Descriptive Problems.
24. Student Interests c/w Academic Disciplines.
25. General Education Values c/w Scholarly Research Values.
26. Heterogeneous Classes c/w Homogeneous Classes.

*See Appendix I for the exact placement of the word-pair variables in the original questionnaire. In this table, all of the most "desirable" variables have been placed in the left-hand column only for purposes of clarity in reporting the findings.

that methods teachers were unhappy with what they perceived as an overly scholarly, cognitive, "structure-of-the discipline" approach to social studies education and they wanted to see relatively greater attention given to the normative, interdisciplinary, affective, and community-centered aspects of social studies education.

But methods educators, as it turned out, were not a homogeneous group. Attitudes toward what ought to be happening in the social studies tended to be closely related to the type of department in which the methods educator held his appointment. Two-thirds (62) in the sample held appointments in departments or schools of education. One-third (32) held other types of appointments such as history or social science departments, or joint appointments. These two groups had distinctly different conceptions of what social studies education should be (Table Four).

* *

Place Table Four About Here

* *

An appointment in a school of education was associated with greater dissatisfaction with the NSS and the materials projects. On the other hand, if a methods educator held his appointment in an academic department, his values tended to be more congruent with the perceived values of the projects. Those who held appointments in education departments consistently took a much more student-centered, social action stance and saw social studies curriculum development as largely a matter of local invention. A methods teacher with an academic appointment was much more likely to assume a scholarly, cognitive, discipline-centered approach to the social studies and to favor a national project conception of development. In any event, the important finding was the fact that among methods educators there were two groups with rather distinctly different values about what ought to be going on in the social studies and who should be doing it.

TABLE FOUR

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SOCIAL STUDIES PREFERENCES OF TEACHER EDUCATORS ACCORDING TO TYPE OF APPOINTMENT

Education Appointments (N62)		Non-education Appointments (N32)	
	compared with		
1. Student Interests	"	Academic Disciplines	($p < .001$)
2. Social Action	"	Social Science	($p < .001$)
3. Heterogeneous Classes	"	Homogeneous Classes	($p < .02$)
4. Self-concept Development	"	Academic Achievement	($p < .01$)
5. Political Efficacy	"	Political Knowledge	($p < .01$)
6. Local Curriculum Development	"	National Curriculum Development(USOE,NSF)	($p < .01$)
7. Teaching Methodology	"	Curriculum Materials Development	($p < .05$)
8. Interdisciplinary Curricula	"	Separate Discipline Curricula	($p < .10$)
9. Affective Domain	"	Cognitive Domain	($p < .001$)
10. Discussion Skill	"	Reading Skill	($p < .001$)
11. Melioration of Social Problems	"	Knowledge of Academic Disciplines	($p < .01$)
12. The Future	"	The Past	($p < .001$)
13. The Present	"	The Past	($p < .01$)

And methods teachers with appointments in schools of education want:

14. less emphasis on historical content	($p < .05$)
15. more emphasis on the assumption that the classroom teacher is the key agent for developing and promoting major curricular changes.	($p < .01$)
16. more emphasis on student-planned goals and activities	($p < .10$)
17. Less emphasis on curriculum development viewed as a pr process of "adoption of pre-packaged curricula" by local schools, departments, teachers, etc.	($p < .02$)

Conclusions and More Questions

Pre-service, secondary school teacher educators who belong to the NCSS generally resist the project notion that social studies curriculum development should take place outside of particular educational situations. As a corollary, teacher educators, particularly those holding appointments in a school of education, tended to prefer an interdisciplinary curriculum designed around the interests, beliefs, values, and life experience of students. They saw the project-centered NSS over-emphasizing such characteristics as separate academic disciplines, homogeneous grouping, and cognitive goals; in short, too much emphasis on the "structure of a discipline" approach.

Given the results of this study, can we assume that the NSS is to be found in pre-service methods classes to the large extent that might be expected? If not, why not? Might it be that methods teachers have deliberately resisted the NSS? Or, maybe the projects in one way or another have ignored or circumvented methods teachers. Have the projects viewed their role as strictly developmental to the exclusion of any educational role? If they have seen an educational role for themselves, has the focus been primarily on in-service education to the exclusion of pre-service education? Or, in another vein, if the materials in fact are being used by pre-service methods teachers, are they being introduced to the prospective teachers in ways that fit the intent of the developers? Finally, to what extent is pre-service education serving to implement and sustain the NSS in secondary schools, and to what degree should it do this? This research raises and sharpens such questions, it does not answer them.

Analysis

What are possible causes behind the several unfavorable perceptions that methods teachers hold about the NSS? There are at least three possible explanations, each of which may call for a different solution. The first explanation is that the NSS products developed by the projects and now being disseminated by commercial publishers have caused the knowledge and skills of methods teachers to become obsolete. This shall be labeled the "obsolescence" hypothesis. Second, the emergence of the projects has created a different way to conduct the developmental role for the social studies thereby separating the developmental and educational roles. This is to be called the "role separation" hypothesis. Third, those who conceived, developed, and promoted the NSS, viz., the project directors and staffs have a set of values about social studies different from the values of the typical teacher educator. This is referred to as the "value conflict" hypothesis.

Let us first examine the "obsolescence" hypothesis. How the NSS threatened to make the skills and knowledge of methods teachers obsolete? This may indeed be the case. Consider, for instance, the following figures taken from the study:

Academic training of method teachers primarily in:

0	(1)	Anthropology
4	(2)	Economics
32	(3)	Education
1	(4)	Geography
42	(5)	History
14	(6)	Political Science
1	(7)	Psychology
3	(8)	Sociology
5	(9)	(Other)

It is generally agreed by teacher educators that the NSS draws heavily on the social sciences and tends to deemphasize history. However, methods teachers are not well-prepared for this shift since according to the above figures, almost 75% consider their primary academic training to have been in either education or history, neither of which is closely associated with the NSS. In addition, the "structure of a discipline" approach of the NSS may make it difficult, if not impossible, for every methods teacher to be his own sociologist, his own anthropologist, his own political scientist, etc. The NSS calls for a combination of breadth and specialization that is difficult to find in any one methods teacher or even in any one social studies teacher education program. At a minimum, the NSS has placed heavy pressures on methods teachers to acquire new skills. Consequently, methods teachers may tend to resist some of the contributions of the projects because the projects have created new expectations for methods instruction and methods teachers are not prepared to meet these expectations.

What solutions are available, if we accept the obsolescence hypothesis? Methods teachers could be "retreaded;" they could learn some of the new skills and knowledge required by the NSS in job-retraining programs. To what extent have the projects made any effort to bridge this gap? A few projects, the High School Geography Project, for example, have put together some smaller packages to be used in pre-service courses and have organized institutes to familiarize methods teachers with the content and processes of the NSS. However, this seems to be the exception, rather than the rule.

In truth, the primary educational effort of the projects seems to have been focused on in-service education. This emphasis on in-service education has had the effect of separating the interests of the projects and many methods

teachers. Consequently, methods teachers have found themselves in the backwaters of social studies education with the lion's share of project "educational" money and resources going to aggressive and alert school districts and high school social studies departments. Not much of this project energy has been directly injected into schools of education. The result has been that many local social studies departments have greater access to the NSS materials than do methods teachers in the schools of education which prepare the teachers for these same schools. Needless to say, this has created problems for methods teachers.

Having the advantage of hindsight, this circumvention of methods educators may have been a mistake. Given the limited resources available to projects for "educational" purposes, in the long run it probably would have been more efficient and productive for the projects to have become selectively involved in pre-service education, thereby taking advantage of what might be called the "multiplier effect." The "multiplier-effect" is based on the belief that a young, enthusiastic beginning teacher is likely to "infect" more colleagues during his professional career with this enthusiasm than is an experienced teacher. Also, this would have tended to create a cadre of skilled university professors who could have given great impetus to the NSS. Since methods teachers are gate-keepers, the original investment would have been returned many times over.

But even if the projects still in existence decided now to give high priority to the education and "retreading" of methods teachers, it would be more difficult than five years ago. My belief is that the most opportune time to convince methods educators of the overriding value of project-based curriculum development has been missed. The growing edge of social studies education seems to be moving away from some of the main assumptions of the NSS. For

example, some social studies educators are now questioning the notion that education is to be equated with formal classroom instruction, an assumption never probed by the NSS.[6] However, whatever these future developments turn out to be, they will be seriously impoverished, in my judgment, if the NSS fails to make a hard thrust into the sanctuaries of teacher education. As much as many teacher educators, including the writer, would like to move rapidly beyond the NSS, post-NSS developments will probably be less productive if methods teachers move from the pre- to the post-NSS eras without being touched by the NSS itself. Unfortunately the projects did not have the vision (nor the resources) to recognize early that the education of teachers of teachers was essential for the long-range maintenance of the NSS.

Turning now to the "role separation " hypothesis, let us assume that the emergence of the projects has created a different way to fulfill the developmental role in the social studies. This different kind of development may have separated the developmental and educational roles which previously had often been embodied in the same person. In the pre-NSS era, methods teachers were often the authors of textbooks and materials used both in schools and in most pre-service classes. Methods teachers were comfortable; they knew the lay of the land. But the materials of the NSS, written not by teacher educators, but more frequently by academicians, put the teacher educator in unfamiliar territory. If this splitting of roles is the source of the uneasiness expressed by methods teachers, then the most obvious solution is to ensure that more developers have a sense of the problems of teacher education and that more teacher educators experience the development of a curriculum product. The answer may not be that simple.

The simultaneous fulfillment of both roles may be contradictory and undesirable. Project curriculum developers (or textbook writers) are always constrained by the harsh facts and broad generalizations of school reality. For example, they are more likely to get their materials into the schools if they develop courses that are almost universally required such as 9th grade Civics or 11th grade U.S. History. Therefore it doesn't make much sense to package a curriculum or write a text on interdisciplinary American Studies, simply because there is no existing slot for such a course and consequently it would not sell. National projects are no different from text writers in this respect, they simply cannot afford to question or ignore too many of these fundamental realities; in the broadestsense they have to develop their curriculum around what already is there. Universities, on the other hand, including education professors, have the role of questioning existing realities.

Perhaps the most overlooked angle of curriculum development in the NSS is the opportunity for materials developers and methods teachers to cooperate in the development of NSS packages for use in pre-service education. Though it is late, because many projects have terminated or are close to it, collaboration at this point would go far toward bridging the gap in terms of both the "obsolescence" and the "role separation" hypotheses. It could be argued that this type of curriculum development is not profitable because the big market is in the elementary and high schools, not in materials for college students. This view is more than a little cynical, short-sighted, and in my judgment not in the best interests of the whole profession.

Lastly, let us examine the "value conflict" hypothesis. At the heart of the differences between the materials projects and methods teachers seems to be a conflicting view of the appropriate role of a social studies teacher.

The study suggests that this may be the most accurate explanation. Methods teachers tend to see teachers as developers and inventors of their own curricula; and the projects do not, at least as the projects are perceived by methods teachers. Among the reasons that methods teachers want to drastically reduce the developmental role of the projects and even more sharply increase the classroom teacher's developmental role is that methods teachers tend to want a kind of social studies that is not easily packaged. As previously noted, teacher educators want more community learning activities, more social action, and more emphasis on the affective domain. Curriculum development is viewed as a situational task, dependent upon the unique characteristics of the people and events involved. It follows that what pre-service social studies teachers need to learn are broad principles of developing a student-centered, community-oriented curriculum, not the specific details of a large number of pre-packaged curricula.

George Mannello, Hofstra University, summed up the value difference between the project developers and teacher educators with this statement:

> Thus, we come back to the teacher, not as an important component of an instructional system but as the center upon which the entire program hinges. There are overarching teacher qualities such as caring, commitment, responsibility and creativity. Without them no educational program no matter how well organized can succeed -- not in the long run. For example, we can visualize a situation in which an instructional system [pre-packaged curriculum] has been generally established for some time and its novelty has worn off. It is quite conceivable that a large number of teachers may follow, cookbook recipe style, the teaching units and lesson plans constructed by experts in just as mechanical and dissociated a manner as in the textbook teaching that systems analysts [project directors] inveigh against. What is to be gained? There is no point in substituting for one "slavish" method (going through the textbook page by page) another method that is apt to become slavish (ticking off the teaching unit). At least in the former the teacher can be less slavish, if he is so

> motivated. In the systems approach, however, with everything so neatly laid out, with materials and strategies so explicit, with the built-in expectation of conformity, the tendency will be to fall into one's place, to become "other-directed." When the teacher loses his feeling of centrality in the teacher-learning act the overarching qualities of good teaching . . . diminish. Instead, he may come to regard himself, just as the analysts say, one of a number of inter-acting parts, and as in any standardized machine replaceable with another identical part. It is dehumanizing.
>
> It is also deprofessionalizing. The teacher who no longer creates, organizes, and directs according to his own perceptions cannot be regarded as a fullfledged professional. He becomes a technician who implements someone else's findings.[7]

Teacher educators tend to believe that involvement in the very process of curriculum development is a central attribute of a successful social studies teacher. It is assumed that this involvement in curriculum development will have direct pay-off in the teaching process. (This assumption needs to be tested and offers a rich area for research in social studies education.)

It is unlikely that those methods teachers who believe in the over-riding value of locally-invented curricula will ever be entirely comfortable with the National project conception of development.[8] One possible way of at least narrowing the value gap is to make curriculum development an important and integral part of our pre-service teacher education programs. It is unlikely that this can be accomplished within the structure of most existing teacher education programs since the pressures of "survival" mitigate against any extensive and systematic participation by student teachers in significant curriculum development programs in their schools. However, if we were to think of Intern programs lasting over one or two year periods, with Interns participating in learning-teaching teams that include university and school personnel working in a differentiated staffing arrangement, a variety of options begin to emerge.[9]

With such a program, the pre- and in-service or the university and field-based distinctions begin to blur. The important point is that if methods educators are really committed to the importance of locally-invented curricula, then we ought to be giving much greater attention to fundamental changes in the structure and organization of existing pre-service teacher education programs. Only then can we adequately introduce pre-service teachers to the difficult problems of developing curricula in real school situations. This will call for a much closer relationship between teacher education programs and local schools.

Summary

My purpose has been to inquire into the impact of the NSS insofar as it is seen through the eyes of social studies methods teachers. It was noted that methods teachers tended to equate the NSS with the major curriculum development projects. Methods teachers agreed with many of the values that they associated with the NSS and the curriculum projects, but they were dissatisfied with the strong developmental role played by the projects in creating and maintaining the NSS. They wanted much of this role shifted from the projects and much more of the developmental responsibility assumed by teachers in the field. In addition, methods teachers were dissatisfied with specific emphases of the NSS. Basically, they saw the NSS as overly academic, cerebral, and teacher-centered. They wanted more emphasis on student interests, community activities, social action, and the affective domain; these qualities are difficult to pre-package. Also, methods teachers who held appointments in schools of education tended to be more dissatisfied with the NSS than methods teachers who held appointments in an academic department.

The unfavorable perceptions of methods teachers about the [illegible] can possibly be explained by any one or a combination of three different hypotheses. These are 1) the "obsolescence" hypothesis; 2) the "role conflict" hypothesis; or 3) the "value conflict" hypothesis. The writer speculates, on the basis of the study, that the value-conflict hypothesis is most explanatory of the three. It also describes the situation most difficult to deal with because it reflects fundamental differences about the nature of a "good" social studies program.

I have tried to surface some of the issues between methods teachers and curriculum projects and give some initial, intellectual structure to these issues so that we can begin to get a clearer picture of what is happening in our profession today. The social studies profession is undergoing a period of flux, letting a "hundred flowers bloom." The uneasiness evinced by teacher educators is a major dimension of this period of flux.[10] Roles and values are changing.

The broad metaphor of "identity crisis" pretty well characterizes what is happening to us. Over the past decade some basic, sometimes threatening, questions have been about who we are and what we are supposed to be doing in schools as social studies educators. Tension does exist. But if it can be viewed as the growing pains of a profession seeking its identity, the tension can be viewed as part of the natural order of things. It can be creative rather than destructive.

Notes

1. See for example John S. Gibson, "The Social Studies Teacher and Curriculum Change," in Dorothy McClure Fraser, ed., Social Studies Curriculum Development: Prospects and Problems, 39th Yearbook, National Council for the Social Studies, 1969, pp. 305-328, particularly page 313. Hazel W. Hertzberg, "The Now Culture: Some Implications for Teacher Training Programs," Social Education, 34:271-279, March 1970. Maurice P. Hunt and Lawrence E. Metcalf, Teaching High School Social Studies, New York, Harper & Row, 1968, p. 280. Fred M. Newmann, "Questioning the Place of Social Science Disciplines Education," Social Education, 31:593-596, November, 1967. James P. Shaver, "Social Studies: The Need for Redefinition," Social Education, 31:588-592, 596, November 1967.

2. Dale L. Brubaker, Alternative Directions for the Social Studies, Scranton, Penn., International Textbook Co., 1967; Shirley H. Engle, "Objectives of the Social Studies," in New Challenges in the Social Studies: Implications of Research for Teaching, pp. 1-19, edited by B.G. Massialas and F.R. Smith, Belmont, Calif., Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc. 1965; and Jan L. Tucker, An Exploratory Classification and Analysis of Selected Problem Areas Within the "New" Social Studies, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 1968.

3. The Harvard Group is the major exception.

4. This total of 806 included both elementary (K-6) and secondary (7-12) college-level instructors of pre-service social studies. For the most part, NCSS membership lists do not distinguish between the two. NCSS estimates that 524 (65%) of the 806 are secondary-level instructors. NCSS also estimates that there is a total of approximately 2000 such instructors.

   The selection of the mailing sample:

   a. Total College and University Membership in the NCSS 806
      Identified by NCSS as secondary (7-12) instructors 69
   b. Undifferentiated membership (both elementary and secondary). . . . (806-65) = 741
   c. Every fourth name on the undifferentiated list (according to zip code) was chosen to be sampled . . . . . $\frac{741}{4}$ = 185
   d. Removal of 16 known elementary level instructors. . . . . (185-16) = ... 169
   e. Final mailing sample 234

5. Estimate of numbers of pre-service, secondary-level instructors in the mailing sample of 234.

   a. Known pre-service, secondary-level instructors 65
   b. Undifferentiated (containing both elementary and secondary instructors) 169
   c. Expected secondary instructors in the undifferentiated group (169 x 65% estimate by the NCSS) 110
   d. Total estimated number of pre-service secondary level instructors in the final mailing sample. 175

It is possible, even theoretically probable, that the 41.1% non-responding population was different from the 58.9% responding population. Because the questionnaire was anonymous, it was difficult to properly test for this possible bias. As a partial check, a T-test comparison was made between the mean responses of the first 40 (Group A) and the last 40 (Group B) respondents, as distinguished by the chronological order in which the completed questionnaires were returned. This was done on the assumption that if Group B differed greatly from Group A, then it could be inferred that the non-responding population might be significantly different from the responding population. On the other hand, confirmation of the null hypothesis would be evidence that the responding and non-responding populations were also similar.

Of a total of 61 variables comprising the "ought-to-be" profile, 7 variables reflected a significant ($p < .05$) difference. In every one of these 7 cases, Group B, the late responders, demonstrated a preference for the choices of the total population. Thus, Group A proved to be the anomolous population in these few instances. Though the data were by no means conclusive, they indicated that the non-responding population was probably quite similar to the total responding population. In fact, in the 7 cases where statistical differences were noted, the evidence was that the non-respondents could very well have been more like the total responding population than were the early respondents (Group A).

6. For instance see Fred M. Newmann and Donald W. Oliver, Clarifying Public Controversy: An Approach to Teaching Social Studies, Boston, Little Brown and Company, 1970, pp. 313-345. A more complete discussion is found in Newmann and Oliver, "Education and Community," Harvard Educational Review, 37:61-106, 1967.

7. George Manello, "Resource Unit versus Instructional System," (mimeo), Hofstra University, n.d.

8. See Henry M. Brickell, "Two Change Strategies for Local School Systems," in Rational Planning in Curriculum and Instruction, NEA Center for the Study of Instruction, 1967, pp. 135-153. Brickell discusses the comparative merits of two conceptions of curriculum development: adoption and local invention.

9. Robert H. Koff and Richard J. Shavelson, "Training Instructional Teams for a Differentiated Approach to Learning: A Description of a Teacher Education Project within the Stanford Teacher Education Program, Stanford University," School of Education, Stanford University, (Mimeo), November 1970.

10. The results of this study have spawned similar analysis of other populations within the social studies. Data are now being collected on practicing secondary social studies teachers and project directors and staff.

METHODS TEACHERS AND THE "NEW" SOCIAL STUDIES (NSS)

Appendix I

COMPARATIVE WORD PAIRS

% of Methods teachers who Agree that the NSS is emphasizing the following characteristics:			% of methods teachers who Disagree with characteristics they perceive are now being emphasized in the NSS. (a)	DID (b)
Very High Agreement (65% or more)				
		Variable Labels (Word Pairs)		
94%	(N=95)	Discussion compared with Lecture	44%	.046
93%	(N=96)	Social Science Concepts c/w Historical Personalities	56%	.178
92%	(N=98)	Generalizations c/w Specific Facts	51%	.255
90%	(N=95)	Values of Scientific Inquiry c/w <u>Patriotic Values</u>	59%	.331*
	(N=96)	Relationships Among Events c/w Specific Facts	38%	.158
89%	(N=96)	Multiple Classroom Resources c/w Single Classroom Resource	39%	.180
88%	(N=94)	Student Talk c/w Teacher Talk	50%	.120
86%	(N=93)	Cosmopolitanism c/w Ethnocentrism	51%	.294
	(N=97)	Thematic History c/w Chronological History	51%	.216
	(N=91)	Cultural Pluralism c/w Cultural Consensus	51%	.098

(a) Indicates a relative shift between the "Are-being" and the "Ought-to-be" emphasized characteristics of the NSS on a five-point response scale: Agree Strongly, Agree, Equal, Agree, and Agree Strongly. Does <u>not</u> indicate the direction of this shift.

(b) DID is the Directional Intensity of Dissatisfaction Index.

$$DID = \frac{ME^1 - ME^2}{ME^1 + ME^2}$$

Where ME^1_2 = the % of respondents desiring more emphasis on Variable 1; and
ME^2 = the % of respondents wanting more emphasis on Variable 2.
(Variable 1 is always the variable with the larger raw number).

DID indicates the "intensity" to which a particular word-variable is preferred over its counterpart. The larger the DID, the greater the intensity. On only those items of statistical significance, (marked with either an "*" or "**") is the preferred variable <u>underlined</u>. (E.G., see Values of Scientific Inquiry c/w <u>Patriotic Values</u> above).

*)
**) $X^2 = \frac{(|A - D| - 1)^2}{A+D}$ with ($p < .05$)

* = expanded format: using all five categories on the response scale to construct a 2x2 contingency table. (liberal calculation)

** = collapsed format: combining agree strongly and agree categories and eliminating the equal category to construct a 2x2 contingency table. (conservative calculation)

% of Methods teachers who Agree that the NSS is emphasizing the following characteristics:			% of methods teachers who Disagree with characteristics they perceive are now being emphasized in the NSS. (a)	DID (b)
Very High Agreement (65% or more)				
		Variable Labels (Word Pairs)		
82%	(N=95)	"Open-ended" Divergent Inquiry c/w "Closed" Convergent Inquiry	42%	.334*
80%	(N=97)	Social Science c/w History	51%	.098
78%	(N=96)	Process c/w Content	60%	.033
77%	(N=97)	Controversial Topics c/w Non-controversial Topics	55%	.491*
	(N=95)	Interpretation of Social Phenomena c/w Description of Social Phenomena	66%	.061
76%	(N=91)	Value Clarification c/w Value Commitment	63%	.324*
	(N=96)	Reconstruction of Values c/w Conservation of Values	54%	.146
73%	(N=93)	Value-included Inquiry c/w Value-excluded Inquiry	56%	.607*
72%	(N=95)	The Present c/w the Past	52%	.000
71%	(N=87)	Social Science c/w Philosophy	60%	.568**
66%	(N=83)	Human Significance c/w Human Efficiency	60%	.567*
65%	(N=92)	Problem-solving Ability c/w Problem-finding Ability	55%	.164
	(N=93)	Rationality c/w Intuition	57%	.053
	(N-93)	Cultural Reality c/w Cultural Ideals	59%	.051
High Agreement (50% to 64%)				
63%	(N=93)	Comparative History c/w National History	61%	.334*
62%	(N=96)	The Present c/w The Future	66%	.425*
61%	(N=89)	Social Science c/w Social Studies	67%	.523**
60%	(N=97)	Interdisciplinary Curricula c/w Separate Discipline Curricula	59%	.424*

(a) and (b): See page one, Appendix I

% of Methods teachers who Agree that the NSS is emphasizing the following characteristics:			% of methods teachers who Disagree with characteristics they perceive are now being emphasized in the NSS. (a)	DID (b)
High Agreement (50% to 64%, cont'd.)		**Variable Labels (Word Pairs)**		
59%	(N=91)	Social Systems c/w Individuals	57%	.509*
	(N=93)	Cognitive Domain c/w Affective Domain	78%	.488*
	(N=96)	Discussion Skill c/w Reading Skill	65%	.446*
	(N=90)	Objectivity c/w Subjectivity	52%	.154
57%	(N=98)	Classroom Activities c/w Community Activities	76%	.684**
	(N=93)	The Future c/w the Past	62%	.193
54%	(N=98)	Pre-packaged Content c/w Teacher-developed Content	66%	.819*
51%	(N=97)	Self-concept Development c/w Academic Achievement	74%	.298*
50%	(N=95)	Social Science c/w Social Action	69%	.420**
Low Agreement (49% or less)				
48%	(N=96)	Curriculum Materials Development c/w Teaching Methodology	62%	.517*
	(N=98)	Academically Above-average Students c/w Academically Below-Average Students	70%	.485*
47%	(N=94)	Melioration of Social Problems c/w Knowledge of Academic Disciplines	69%	.595*
	(N=93)	National Curriculum Development (USOE, NSF, etc.) c/w Local Curriculum Development	74%	.460**
	(N=90)	Political Efficacy c/w Political Knowledge	63%	.143
46%	(N=98)	Independent Study c/w Group Study	57%	.193
45%	(N=93)	History as a Humanistic Discipline c/w History as a Scientific Discipline	65%	.323*
44%	(N=93)	In-service Teacher Education c/w Pre-service Teacher Education	72%	.139
43%	(N=89)	Descriptive Problems c/w Normative Problems	63%	.460*

(a) and (b): See page one, Appendix I .

% of Methods teachers who Agree that the NSS is emphasizing the following characteristics:			% of methods teachers who Disagree with characteristics they perceive are now being emphasized in the NSS (a)	DID (b)
Low Agreement (59% or less, cont'd.)				
		Variable Labels (Word Pairs)		
42%	(N=98)	Student Interests c/w Academic Disciplines	70%	.429*
41%	(N=92)	General Education Values c/w Scholarly Research Values	68%	.412*
38%	(N=85)	Heterogeneous Classes c/w Homogeneous Classes	72%	.472*

(a) and (b): See page one, Appendix I.

METHODS TEACHERS AND THE "NEW" SOCIAL STUDIES
AGREE - DISAGREE, LICKERT TYPE

Appendix II

% of Methods teachers who Agree that the NSS is emphasizing the following characteristics:			% of methods teachers who Disagree with characteristics they perceive are now being emphasized in the NSS (a)	DID (b)
Very High Agreement (65% or more)				
		THE NSS IS EMPHASIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF . . .		
76%	(N=99)	. dealing with the problems of disadvantaged minority groups in our society. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	60%	.633*
69%	(N=99)	. flexible patterns of classroom management, e.g., seating and behavior rules. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	66%	.729*
69%	(N=99)	. measurable performance objectives (More Emphasis/ Less Emphasis)	59%	.594*
66%	(N=99)	. increased academic freedom for secondary social studies teachers. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	69%	.740*
High Agreement (50% to 64%)				
64%	(N=99)	. curriculum development viewed as a process of "adoption of pre-packaged curricula" by local schools, departments, teachers, etc. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	71%	.739**
51%	(N=99)	. student planned goals and activities. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	71%	.465**
Low Agreement (49% or less)				
45%	(N=98)	. social action as a planned-for outcome of instruction. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	65%	.477*
41%	(N=99)	. maintaining the integrity" of the separate disciplines. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	64%	.530**
40%	(N=99)	. increased civil rights for high school students. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	71%	.635*
34%	(N=99)	. the assumption that the classroom teacher is the key agent for developing and promoting major curriculum changes. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	71%	.661**
33%	(N=99)	. curriculum development viewed as a process of "invention" by local schools, departments, teachers, etc. (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	62%	.679**
30%	(N=100)	. historical content (More Emphasis/Less Emphasis)	66%	.067

(a) and (b): See page one, Appendix I